UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,018	03/08/2006	Mikio Shoji	023312-0122	4736
	7590 06/17/200 LARDNER LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 500	T NIXI	EMCH, GREGORY S		
3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/571,018	SHOJI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Gregory S. Emch	1649			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 M</u>	arch 2006.				
•	action is non-final.				
· <u> </u>					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>23-43</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) <u>23-43</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		d			
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies flot receive	u.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	nte			
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicants are required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 23-42, drawn to a method for preventing and/or treating Alzheimer's disease, mild cognitive impairment or cerebral amyloid angiopathy, which comprises administering to a mammal an effective dose of a monoclonal antibody, which specifically reacts with a partial peptide at the C-terminal region of a β -amyloid or a derivative thereof and which does not recognize a partial peptide having the amino acid sequence represented by SEQ ID NO: 8.

Group II, claim(s) 43, drawn to an agent for preventing and/or treating Alzheimer's disease, mild cognitive impairment or cerebral amyloid angiopathy, comprising a monoclonal antibody, which specifically reacts with a partial peptide at the C-terminal region of a β -amyloid or a derivative thereof and which does not recognize a partial peptide having the amino acid sequence represented by SEQ ID NO: 8.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking Groups I and II is that they both relate to a monoclonal antibody, which specifically reacts with a partial peptide at the C-terminal region of a β-amyloid or a derivative thereof and which does not recognize a partial peptide having the amino acid sequence represented by SEQ ID NO: 8 (i.e. β-amyloid (25-35)). However, U.S. Patent No. 5,750,349 to Suzuki et al. (citation no. A1 from

Art Unit: 1646

Applicants' IDS dated 08 March 2006) teaches using the C-terminal peptide β-amyloid

Page 3

(35-43) as an immunogen to raise antibodies and teaches that a monoclonal antibody

specific for this peptide does not cross-react with A\(\beta\)1-40 (col.3, line 66 - col.4, line 27).

Thus, the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I and II does not constitute a

special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a

contribution over the prior art.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic

invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so

linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: β-amyloid peptides:

a. SEQ ID NO: 1

b. SEQ ID NO: 2

c. SEQ ID NO: 3

d. SEQ ID NO: 4

e. SEQ ID NO: 5

f. SEQ ID NO: 6

The following claim(s) are generic: 23-27 and 30-43.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept

under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or

corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: they are drawn to

structurally unique peptides, wherein the use of one species does not require the use of any other species.

Page 4

Applicants are required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicants will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicants must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species and invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result

Application/Control Number: 10/571,018 Page 6

Art Unit: 1646

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1646

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory S. Emch whose telephone number is (571) 272-8149. The examiner can normally be reached 9:00 am - 5:30 pm EST (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey J. Stucker can be reached at (571) 272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory S. Emch/

Gregory S. Emch, Ph.D. Patent Examiner Art Unit 1649
10 June 2008

/Elizabeth C. Kemmerer/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646